

---

**From:** Hilary Wood [mailto:abalone2000@mchsi.com]

**Sent:** Tuesday, November 06, 2007 9:11 AM

**To:** MLPAComments

**Subject:** MLPA plan

To Whom It May Concern,

In perusing your MLPA website, I would like to point out the lack of serious consideration for alternatives concerning the proposed closure of the Richardson Ranch for the proposed MPA. The arguments in favor of this closure make absolutely no sense and the consequences outweigh the positives in this case. Historically, the landowners have done a tremendously good job in patrolling their property, maintaining it and blocking access to the public. Enforcement of an MPA takes money which is better spent on public land which is severely neglected. The landowners, by virtue of their sentinel stance on public access have already protected marine life and will continue to do so. Enforcing an MPA on Salt Point State Park and areas north and south is a much better solution and I'm not even sure there is a real problem here. Complete protection may not be warranted for some resources. We have plenty of State Marine Preserves.

My children grew up fishing, socializing and playing on Richardson property. The ocean and its resources are an integral part of who they are. As a very tight community, we even held many memorials for those of us who passed away, along the Richardson shoreline. The very heart of tradition, custom and heritage is at stake here. Recreational fishing is all part of it.

I am appalled that the landowners have no voice in the upcoming decisions. If this is not illegal, it should be. That an agency can make these decisions minus land owner's rights or input is frightening.

I urge you NOT to site SMCA's and SMR's adjacent to and on privately held property. There are other MPA's that need attention and other areas that would benefit far more than an area of private property that is already protected by the land owners.

Hilary Wood  
504 Las Posas St.  
Ridgecrest, CA 93555  
760-382-7558